UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,686	05/31/2001	G. Eric Engstrom	109911-130412	2508

			EXAMINER
25943	7590	11/20/2006	TRUONG, CAM Y T

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/872,686	ENGSTROM, G. ERIC
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cam Y T. Truong	2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 October 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-17 and 29-32* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-17 and 29-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 8, 29 and 31 in the amendment filed on

10/31/2006.

Claims 1-5, 7-17 and 29-32 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 5/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that the combination does not teach claim 1.

As to claim 1, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving an input for a first time-slot of a plurality of time-slots of a first party's

calendar from a second party" as receiving a non-owner or a user first enters the start

time and end times of the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 of a owner's

L.M. The owner L.M is represented as a first party. The non-owner is represented as a

second party (col. 9, lines 30-32; col. 10, lines 22-30),

"the first and second parties being different parties" as the non-owner or a user

and the owner are being different owners (col. 9, lines 30-32; col. 10, lines 22-30),

"having a plurality of access privileges for the time-slots of the first pady's

calendar" as having a plurality of access levels for slots of the owner's calendar (col.

53-67 ; col. 10, lines 1 - 1 5);

"processing said received input in accordance with the access privilege of the

Second party's associated group affiliation or user type or both" as a non-owner who

has requested a view of the day calendar of L.M. User that was shown in figs. 4A and

4B. The requesting non-owner has an access level of 3 so that all time slots having

calendared events are shown and all descriptions except secret and personal are

displayed. The above information shows that the system process user's

input. The non-owner is not associated with group affiliation and/or user time (col. 53-

67 ; col. 1 0,lines 1 -1 5),

"wherein the plurality of access privileges are defined for specific time-slots" as

there are 5 levels of access permission not including the access permission level

established for an owner to view his own calendar that includes time slots. The above

information shows that the system defined access levels for time slots of the calendar

(col. 9,lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "second party's associated

group affiliation or user type or both for the first time -slot; the second party being

associated with a group affiliation or a user type or both; and the group affiliation or user

type or both".

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in

the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group

(col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group

calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access

the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for

different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to

share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level

access.

Applicant argued that Vincent does not teach "wherein the plurality of access

privileges are defined for specific time-slots".

In response to applicant argument, Vincent teaches there are 5 levels of access

permission not including the access permission level established for an owner to view

his own calendar that includes time slots. The above information shows that the system

defined access levels for time slots of the calendar (col. 9,lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Applicant argued that there is not motivation for combining of Vincent, Barnett,

and Falkenhainer.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the

references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re*

Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, It would have

been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Falkenhainer's teaching of access privilege with an

ability of writing to Vincent's system in order to prevent non-authority user to modify an

owner's calendar without permission and further to allow a owner of a record to update

a entry in a record.

For the above reason, examiner believed that the previous office action teaches

the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-5, 8-17, 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Vincent (US 4881 179) in view of Barnett et al (or hereinafter

"Barnetf') (US 6369840).

As to claim 1, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving an input for a first time-slot of a plurality of time-slots of a first party's

calendar from a second party" as receiving a non-owner or a user first enters the start

time and end times of the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 of a owner's

L.M. The owner L.M is represented as a first party. The non-owner is represented as a

second party (col. 9, lines 30-32; col. 10, lines 22-30),

"the first and second parties being different parties" as the non-owner or a user

and the owner are being different owners (col. 9, lines 30-32; col. 10, lines 22-30),

"having a plurality of access privileges for the time-slots of the first pady's

calendar" as having a plurality of access levels for slots of the owner's calendar (col.

53-67 ; col. 10, lines 1 - 1 5);

"processing said received input in accordance with the access privilege of the

Second party's associated group affiliation or user type or both" as a non-owner who

has requested a view of the day calendar of L.M. User that was shown in figs. 4A and

4B. The requesting non-owner has an access level of 3 so that all time slots having

calendared events are shown and all descriptions except secret and personal are

displayed. The above information shows that the system process user's

input. The non-owner is not associated with group affiliation and/or user time (col. 53-

67 ; col. 1 0,lines 1 -1 5),

"wherein the plurality of access privileges are defined for specific time-slots" as

there are 5 levels of access permission not including the access permission level

established for an owner to view his own calendar that includes time slots. The above

information shows that the system defined access levels for time slots of the calendar

(col. 9,lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "second party's associated

group affiliation or user type or both for the first time -slot; the second party being

associated with a group affiliation or a user type or both; and the group affiliation or user

type or both".

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in

the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group

(col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group

calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access

the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for

different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to

share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level

access.

As to claim 2, Vincent and Barnett teaches the claimed limitation subject matter

1, Barnett further teaches "defining, before said receiving, the access privileges of the

group affiliation or both or user type, for the plurality of time-slots of said calendar" as a

user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every

group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the

group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

As to claim 3, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the access

Privileges include a first access privilege with an ability to read data of said first time-

slot, and an ability to write data into the first time-slot" as (figs. 4A and 5).

As to claim 4, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations "receiving a request for

calendar entry or entries for a first time-slot of a plurality of time-slots of a first party's

calendar, wherein the request is submitted by a second party associated with a group

affiliation or user type or both" as a non-owner who has requested a view of the day

calendar of L.M. User that was shown in figs. 4A and 4B. The requesting non-owner has

an access level of 3 so that all time slots having calendared events are shown and all

descriptions except secret and personal are displayed. The above information shows

that the system process user's input. The non-owner is not associated with group

affiliation and/or user time (col. 53-67; col. 10, lines 1-15),

"the first and second parties being different party" as non-owner is different

from the calendar's owner (col. 10, lines 20-30)

"or user type or both having a plurality of access privileges for the plurality of

time-slots of the first party's calendar" as non-owner such as administrative assistant or

secretary having a plurality of access levels to a owner calendar for the plurality of time-

slots of the owner's calendar (col. 9, lines 53-67; col. 10, lines 20-38),

"selectively providing calendar entry or entries for the first time-slot, in

accordance with the access privilege of the group affiliation and/or user type for the

first time slot" as providing calendar entry for the start time and end time in accordance with access level of 3 of a non-owner. This owner can be secretary or administrative assistant. This providing is accordance with the access privilege of a user type such as secretary or administrative assistant type and not accordance with the access privilege of (col. 10, lines 20-38);

"wherein the plurality of access privileges are defined for specific time-slots" as there are 5 levels of access permission not including the access permission level established for an owner to view his own calendar that includes time slots. The above information shows that the system defined access levels for time slots of the calendar (col. 9,lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicilty teach the claimed limitation "group affiliation". Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level access.

As to claim 5, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "defining, before said

receiving, the access privileges of the group affiliation or user type or both, for the time-

slots of said calendar" as displaying to a non-owner who has requested a view of the

day calendar of LM. The requesting non-owner has an access level of 3 so that all time

slots having calendared events are shown and all descriptions except secret and

personal are displayed. The calendar owner allow a specified person to have access to

his calendar at a specified security level which may be different that the general access

level that has been assigned to that person by the system. This function allows a

calendar owner to grant access to his calendar to an administrative assistant or

secretary. The above information shows that the system defines time slots of the

calendar. The system does not define the access privileges of the group affiliation (col.

10, lines 20-40).

Vincent does not explicity teach the claimed limitation group affiliation". Barnett

teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group,

where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different

levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2,

lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group

calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access

the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for

different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to

share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level

access.

As to claim 8, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations "designating by a computer

system a plurality of access privileges to a plurality of time-slots of a first user's calendar

for a user group or user type or both" as designated a plurality of access levels to a

plurality of time slots of a owner's calendar for an administrative assistant type and not

for a user group (col. 9, lines 52- 67 ; col. 1 0, lines 1 -1 0),

"granting or denying access by the computer system to a first time-slot of the

plurality of time-slots to said second user in accordance with the access privilege

for the first time-slot of the user group and/or type determined for said second user"

as grant access to a owner's calendar of the plurality of time-slots in accordance with

access level 3 for the start time slot of user type and not the user group (col. 10, lines

20-40),

"wherein the plurality of access privileges are defined for specific time-slots" as

there are 5 levels of access permission not including the access permission level

established for an owner to view his own calendar that includes time slots. The above

information shows that the system defined access levels for time slots of the calendar

(col. 9,lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "user group; determining

by said computer system that a second user being a member of said user group and/or

type". Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level access.

As to claim 9, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein said second user has a user identification identifiable to the user group or user type or both".

Barnett teaches a user may elect to login at this point by providing input specifying a login identifier and password. This allows system 100 to retrieve user-specific information, by reference to a record stored in database 104 of the system. If the user has not used the system before, he or she is prompted to sign up in 302, by selecting a login identifier and password for future reference. A new record is created and stored for the user. The user is also given the option of signing up in a group using the group sign-up page 304, which allows the user to share his or her calendar with other

members of selected groups. Page 303 contains a description of groups and their

operation (col. 7, lines 45-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user may elect to login at this

point by providing input specifying a login identifier and password. This allows system

100 to retrieve user-specific information, by reference to a record stored in database

104 of the system. If the user has not used the system before, he or she is prompted to

sign up in 302, by selecting a login identifier and password for future reference. A new

record is created and stored for the user. The user is also given the option of signing

up in a group using the group sign-up page 304, which allows the user to share his or

her calendar with other members of selected groups. Page 303 contains a description

of groups and their operation tp Vincent's system in order to allow a non-owner to

access a owner's calendar for update owner's calendar.

As to claim 10, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "reading

into said computer system said second user's user identification and said access

privileges". Barnett teaches a user may elect to login at this point by providing input

specifying a login identifier and password. This allows system 100 to retrieve user-

specific information, by reference to a record stored in database 104 of the system. If

the user has not used the system before, he or she is prompted to sign up in 302, by

selecting a login identifier and password for future reference. A new record is created

and stored for the user. The user is also given the option of signing up in a group

using the group sign-up page 304, which allows the user to share his or her calendar

with other members of selected groups. Different access can assign to different

member of group. Page 303 contains a description of groups and their operation (col.

7, lines 45-67; col. 2, lines 60-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user may elect to login at this

point by providing input specifying a login identifier and password. This allows system

100 to retrieve user-specific information, by reference to a record stored in database

104 of the system. If the user has not used the system before, he or she is prompted to

sign up in 302, by selecting a login identifier and password for future reference. A new

record is created and stored for the user. The user is also given the option of signing

up in a group using the group sign-up page 304, which allows the user to share his or

her calendar with other members of selected groups. Page 303 contains a description

of groups and their operation to Vincent's system in order to allow a non-owner to

access a owner's calendar for update owner's calendar.

As to claim 11 , Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "including the

computer 'system facilitating said first user in providing said use group or user type or

both and said access privileges" as providing a plurality of access levels to a plurality

of time slots of a owner's calendar for an administrative assistant type and not for a

user group (fig. 5, col. 9, lines 52-67., col. 10, lines 1-10).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "user group".

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in

the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group

(col. 2, lines 61 -64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group

calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access

the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for

different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to

share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level

access.

As to claim 12, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "facilitating the second

user in inputting data into the first time-slot, the user group or user type or both having

an access privilege to the first time-slot including an ability to write data into the first

time slot" as receiving a non-owner or a user first enters the start time and end times of

the event being calendared into columns 47 and 48 of a owner's L.M. The owner L.M is

represented as a first party. The non-owner is represented as a second party. The

above information shows that the user (not user group) having an access privilege to

write data into the start time slot (col. 9, lines 30-32., col. 10, lines 22-30).

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in

the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group

(col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group

calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access

the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for

different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to

share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level

access.

As to claim 13, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said calendar

includes an event that spans the first and at least a second time-slot, and the method

fudher comprises said computer system omitting descriptive data of said event when

said second user accesses said first time slot, if said user group or user type or both

does not has read access to all of said at least a second time-slot, even if said user

group or user type or both has read access to said first time-slot" as (figs. 4A-5).

As to claim 14, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation " including

the computer system facilitating the second user in editing data ....time-slot".

Barnett teaches a user can select individual event categories and/or

subdivisions for display in Favorite Events pages 313-315. Selecting an event category

in this manner is referred to as "subscribing" to the event category. Favorite Events

pages 313-315 display selected events in either a Day View 313, a Week View

314, or a Month View 315. Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual

events from the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar. The

user can also access an Edit Favorites page 316 which allows him or her to add

or remove categories and/or subdivisions from display in favorite Events pages

313-315. The user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group,

where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different

levels of access can be specified for different members of the group. The user can

also import events from other users' calendars. In addition, purchases of products,

services, or tickets can be effected using links associated with displayed

events (col. 2, lines 55-67., col. 8, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of the user can select individual

event categories and/or subdivisions for display in Favorite Events pages 313-315.

Selecting an event category in this manner is referred to as "subscribing" to the event

category. Favorite Events pages 313-315 display selected events in either a Day View

313, a Week View 314, or a Month View 315. Pages 313-315 allow a user to select

individual events from the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar.

The user can also access an Edit Favorites page 316 which allows him or her to add

or remove categories and/or subdivisions from display in favorite Events pages

313-315. The user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group,

where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different

levels of access can be specified for different members of the group. The user can

also impod events from other users' calendars. In addition, purchases of products,

services, or tickets can be effected using links associated with displayed

events to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to specify categories of events, to

view events belonging to the specified categories from outside sources, and to add

selected events from the outside sources to a personal calendar.

As to claim 15, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein

first time-slot includes a time-slot of one specific date, a corresponding time-slot

on each of a number of week days of a week, or a corresponding time-slot on each of

a week day of a number of weeks". Barnett teaches time slot includes a time slot

of a date corresponding to a number week days of a week (figs. 9 & 13).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Vincent's teaching of time slot includes a time

slot of a date corresponding to a number week days of a week to Vincent's system in

order to provide a improve method of scheduling meetings which permits an operator to

select desired times, dates and attendees correctly.

As to claim 16, Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "including

the computer system facilitating the second user in categorizing a meeting, an

appointment, a reminder, an event, an anniversary, categorizing a family event, a

school meeting, and a social event for said first user's calendar". Barnett teaches

categorizing a meeting, an event in calendar of another user as shown in fig. 13. The

above information shows it would has been obvious to categorizing different type of

events such as school meeting, family event or anniversary (figs. 1 1-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of categorizing a meeting, an event

in calendar of another user to Vincent's system in order to provide a improve method of

scheduling meetings which permits an operator to select desired times, dates and

attendees correctly.

As to claim 17, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "wherein granting and/or

denying access is further based on an event type of an event to be read from or written

into said first time-slot by said second user" as (col. 10, lines 40-60).

As to claim 29, Vincent teaches the claimed limitations:

"computer readable medium" as removable storage (col. 6, lines 20-30).,

"storage medium" as disk (col. 6, lines 20-25)., and

"a number of programming instructions stored in the storage medium, and

designed to program an apparatus" as (col. 6, lines 20-35) "to enable the apparatus to

designated a plurality of access privileges to a plurality of time-slots of a first user's

calendar for a user group and/or user type" as designated a plurality of access levels to

a plurality of time slots of a owner's calendar for an administrative assistant type and

not for a user group (col. 9, lines 52-67., col. 10, lines 1-10),

"grant or deny access to a first time-slot of the plurality of time-slots to said

second

user in accordance with the access privilege for the first time-slot of the user group

and/or type determined for said second user" as grant access to a owner's calendar of

the plurality of time-slots in accordance with access level 3 for the stad time slot of

user type and not the user group (col. 10, lines 20-40),

"wherein the plurality of access privileges are defined for specific time-slots" as

there are 5 levels of access permission not including the access permission level

established for an owner to view his own calendar that includes time slots. The above

information shows that the system defined access levels for time slots of the calendar

(col. 9,lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicitly the claimed limitation "user group, that a second user

being a member of said user group or type or both". Barnett teaches a user can set up a

group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can

access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified

for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group

calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access

the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specised for

different member members of the group to Vincent's system in order to allow a user to

share selected calendar information with other user of a group in a security level

access.

As to claim 30, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "perform said granting

and/or denying access based on an event type of an event to be read from or written

into said first time-slot by said second user" as (fig. 5, col. 10, lines 1-30).

As to claim 31, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "a processor" as processor

(col. 5, lines 67-68), and

"calendar module operated by the processor" as a calendar method operated

by processor (col. 5, lines 60-67), and

"adapted to facilitate designating a plurality of access privileges to a plurality of

time-slots of a first user's calendar for a user group and/or user type" as designated a

plurality of access levels to a plurality of time slots of a owner's calendar for an

administrative assistant type and not for a user group (col. 9, lines 52-67; col. 10, lines

1 - 1 0),

"granting or denying access to a first time-slot of the plurality of time-slots to said

second user in accordance with the access privilege for the first time-slot of

the user group and/or type determined for said second user" as grant access to a

owner's calendar of the plurality of time-slots in accordance with access level 3 for

the start time slot of user type and not the user group (col. 10, lines 20-40),

"wherein the plurality of access privileges are defined for specific time-slots" as

there are 5 levels of access permission not including the access permission level

established for an owner to view his own calendar that includes time slots. The above

information shows that the system defined access levels for time slots of the calendar

(col. 9,lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 3-5).

Vincent does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "determining that a

second user being a member of said user group or type or both; user group". Barnett

teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group,

where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different

levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2,

lines 61- 64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching to Vincent's system in order to allow

a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security

level access.

As to claim 32, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the calendar

module is further adapted to perform said panting and/or denying access based on an

event type of an event to be read from or written into said first time-slot by said

second user" as (col. 10, lines 1-30).

6.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vincent

(US 4881 179) in view of Barnett et al (or hereinafter "Barnett") (US 6369840) and

further in view of Falkenhainer et al (or hereinafter "Falkenhainer") (US 5930801).

As to claim 7, Vincent teaches the claimed limitation "and an ability viewing an entry in said first time-slot" as (fig. 5). Vincent does not explicit teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the access privileges include an access privilege with an ability of writing an entry into said first time-slot". Falkenhainer teaches access privilege with an ability of writing (fig. 2, col. 60-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Falkenhainer's teaching of access privilege with an ability of writing to Vincent's system in order to prevent non-authority user to modify an owner's calendar without permission and further to allow a owner of a record to update a entry in a record.

Contact Information

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571)

272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cam Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162
7/26/2006